arXiv:1301.1015v1 [math.AC] 6 Jan 2013

THE CONCEPTS OF DEPTH OF A PAIR OF IDEALS (I, J) ON MODULES AND (I, J)-COHEN–MACAULAY MODULES

M. AGHAPOURNAHR[1], KH. AHMADI-AMOLI[2], AND M. Y. SADEGHI[3]

Abstract. We introduce a generalization of the notion of depth of an ideal on a module by applying the concept of local cohomology modules with respect to a pair of ideals. Some vanishing theorems are given for this invariant. Vanishing of these kind of local cohomology modules are related to the vanishing of local cohomology modules with respect to an ideal. We show that local cohomology with respect to an arbitrary pair of ideals (I, J) are concerned with the local cohomology with respect to a pair of ideals whose the first ideal is generated by any k-regular sequence in I. We also introduce the concept of (I, J)-Cohen–Macaulay modules as a generalization of the concept of Cohen–Macaulay modules. These kind of modules are different from Cohen–Macaulay modules, as an example shows. Also an artinian result for such modules is given.

1. Introduction

Let R be a commutative noetherian ring, I , J be two ideals of R, and M be an R-module. Many generalizations of the notion of depth of an ideal on a module have been introduced for various purposes, such as depth, f-depth, g depth, and k-depth ($k \geq -1$) of an ideal introduced in [15], [4], [12], and [14], respectively.

In this paper, we introduce a new depth related to a pair of ideals on a module which is concerned with the local cohomology modules with respect to that pair of ideals introduced by Takahashi, Yoshino, and Yoshizawa [17]. For this purpose, in section 2, we first prove a main Theorem 2.6 on the vanishing of both local cohomology with respect to a pair of ideals and the ordinary one. This theorem plays a main role to obtain the other results in this paper. For instance, for a non-negative integer t, vanishing of $\mathrm{H}^i_{I,J}(M)$ for all $i < t$ is equivalent to the vanishing of $\mathrm{H}^i_{\mathfrak{a}}(M)$ for any $\mathfrak{a} \in \tilde{W}(I, J)$ and all $i < t$ (see Corollary 2.7). In Corollary 2.11, we obtain a general result on an arbitrary Serre class $\mathcal{S}$. Applying this result for $\mathcal{S} = 0$, we obtain a necessary and sufficient condition for the vanishing and finiteness of $\mathrm{H}^t_{I,J}(M)$ (see Corollary 2.12).

By using the concept of k-regular sequence [6], we show that local cohomology with respect to an arbitrary pair of ideals is concerned with the local cohomology with respect to a pair of ideals whose one of the ideals is generated by any k-regular sequence. This generalizes [13, Lemma 3.4] to a noetherian ring which is not necessary local (see Theorem 2.13).

In section 3, we introduce the concept of depth of a pair of ideals (I, J) on an R-module M, denoted by $\operatorname{depth}(I, J, M)$. This invariant equals to

$$\inf\left\{i \in \mathbb{N}_0 \mid \mathrm{H}^i_{I,J}(M) \neq 0\right\}$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 13D45, 13E05, 14B15.

Key words and phrases. local cohomology modules defined by a pair of ideals, local cohomology, Serre subcategory, associated primes, ZD-modules, depth of a pair of ideals, (I, J)-Cohen–Macaulay modules, Cohen–Macaulay modules.

(see Proposition 3.3). We prove some formulas and inequalities for this invariant and examine how it behaves under various ideal theoretic operations and short exact sequences (see Corollary 3.4–Theorem 3.6). Also, we show that this is less than or equal to the ordinary depth of an ideal (see Corollary 3.4). The non-equality is shown in Example 4.3. For a finite R-module M and any $\mathfrak{a} \in \tilde{W}(I,J)$ with $\mathfrak{a}M \neq M$, we present some conditions under which $\operatorname{depth}(\mathfrak{a}, M)$ equals to $\operatorname{depth}(I,J,M)$ (see Theorem 3.7). It is well-known that

$$\operatorname{depth}(I,M) = \inf\left\{i \in \mathbb{N}_0 \mid \mathrm{H}^i_I(M) \neq 0\right\}.$$

We show that if $t = \operatorname{depth}(I,J,M)$ and $\mathrm{H}^t_I(M) \neq 0$, then $t = \operatorname{depth}(I,M)$ (see Theorem 3.9).

In section 4, by applying the concept of depth of a pair of ideals, we introduce the concept of (I,J)-Cohen–Macaulay modules over noetherian rings, as a generalization of Cohen–Macaulay modules over local rings, for $I = \mathfrak{m}$ and $J = 0$. These two concepts are not the same, as it is shown in Propositions 4.8 and 4.9 and Example 4.11 (iii). Indeed, for a local integral domain R, and a faithful finite R-module M, which is (I,J)-Cohen–Macaulay module (with $J \neq 0$), if $t = \operatorname{depth}(I,J,M)$ and $\operatorname{Hom}_R\left(R/\mathfrak{m}, \mathrm{H}^t_{I,J}(M))\right) \neq 0$, then M is not Cohen–Macaulay. In Example 4.4, we show that the Grothendieck's non-vanishing Theorem does not hold for local cohomology modules with respect to a pair of ideals and in Examples 4.11, we show that if the condition $\operatorname{Hom}_R\left(R/\mathfrak{m}, \mathrm{H}^t_{I,J}(M))\right) \neq 0$ does not hold in Proposition 4.8, the assertions do not necessarily hold. Finally, an artinian result for M/JM is proved in Proposition 4.14, for a finite (I,J)-torsion R-module M which is (I,J)-Cohen–Macaulay module.

2. VANISHING OF $\mathrm{H}^i_{I,J}(M)$

In the next proposition, $\operatorname{Mod}(R)$ is denoted the category of R-modules and R-homomorphisms, and $\mathcal{S}$ is denoted a Serre subcategory of $\operatorname{Mod}(R)$.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\mathfrak{a} \in \tilde{W}(I,J)$. Let $\mathrm{G} : \operatorname{Mod}(R) \to \operatorname{Mod}(R)$ be a left exact covariant functor such that $\left(0 :_X \mathfrak{a}\right) = \left(0 :_{\mathrm{G}(X)} \mathfrak{a}\right)$ for any R-module X and $\mathrm{G}(E)$ be an injective R-module for any injective R-module E. For a non-negative integer t, consider the natural homomorphism*

$$\psi : \operatorname{Ext}^t_R\left(R/\mathfrak{a}, M\right) \longrightarrow \operatorname{Hom}_R\left(R/\mathfrak{a}, \mathrm{G}^t(M)\right).$$

(i) *If $\operatorname{Ext}^{t-j}_R\left(R/\mathfrak{a}, \mathrm{G}^j(M)\right) \in \mathcal{S}$ for all $j < t$, then $\operatorname{Ker} \psi \in \mathcal{S}$.*
(ii) *If $\operatorname{Ext}^{t+1-j}_R\left(R/\mathfrak{a}, \mathrm{G}^j(M)\right) \in \mathcal{S}$ for all $j < t$, then $\operatorname{Coker} \psi \in \mathcal{S}$.*
(iii) *If $\operatorname{Ext}^{n-j}_R\left(R/\mathfrak{a}, \mathrm{G}^j(M)\right) \in \mathcal{S}$ for $n = t,\ t+1$ and all $j < t$, then $\operatorname{Ker} \psi$ and $\operatorname{Coker} \psi$ both belong to $\mathcal{S}$. Thus $\operatorname{Ext}^t_R\left(R/\mathfrak{a}, M\right) \in \mathcal{S}$ iff $\operatorname{Hom}_R\left(R/\mathfrak{a}, \mathrm{G}^t(M)\right) \in \mathcal{S}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathrm{F}(-) = \operatorname{Hom}_R\left(R/\mathfrak{a}, -\right)$. Then for any R-module X we have, $\mathrm{FG}(X) = \mathrm{F}(X)$. Now, the assertion follows from [2, Proposition 3.1]. □

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\mathfrak{a} \in \tilde{W}(I,J)$ and X be an R-module. Then*

$$\left(0 :_X \mathfrak{a}\right) = \left(0 :_{\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(X)} \mathfrak{a}\right) = \left(0 :_{\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a},J}(X)} \mathfrak{a}\right) = \left(0 :_{\Gamma_{I,J}(X)} \mathfrak{a}\right).$$

In particular, for any ideal $\mathfrak{b} \in \tilde{W}(I,0)$, we have

(i) $\left(0 :_X \mathfrak{b}\right) = \left(0 :_{\Gamma_{\mathfrak{b}}(X)} \mathfrak{b}\right) = \left(0 :_{\Gamma_{\mathfrak{b},J}(X)} \mathfrak{b}\right) = \left(0 :_{\Gamma_{I,J}(X)} \mathfrak{b}\right) = \left(0 :_{\Gamma_I(X)} \mathfrak{b}\right)$.
(ii) $\left(0 :_X \mathfrak{b}\right) = \left(0 :_{\Gamma_{\mathfrak{b},J}(X)} \mathfrak{b}\right) \subseteq \left(0 :_{\Gamma_{\mathfrak{b},J}(X)} I\right) \subseteq \left(0 :_{\Gamma_{I,J}(X)} I\right) = \left(0 :_X I\right)$.

Remark 2.3. Let $(\Lambda, \leq\ )$ be a (non-empty) directed partially ordered set. By an inverse family of ideals of R over Λ, we mean a family $(\mathfrak{b}_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\Lambda}$ of ideals of R such that, whenever $(\alpha,\beta)\in\Lambda\times\Lambda$ with $\alpha\geq\beta$, we have $\mathfrak{b}_\alpha\subseteq\mathfrak{b}_\beta$. For the inverse family of ideals $\mathcal{B}=(\mathfrak{b}_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\Lambda}$, we shall denote $\mathrm{H}^i_{\mathcal{B}}(M):=\varinjlim_{\alpha\in\Lambda}\mathrm{Ext}^i_R\left(R/\mathfrak{b}_\alpha, M\right)$ (see [8, 1.2.10, 1.2.11, and 2.1.10]).

Proposition 2.4. *Let $\mathcal{B}=(\mathfrak{b}_\alpha)_{\alpha\in\Lambda}$ be an inverse family of elements of $\tilde{W}(I,J)$ over Λ and $t\in\mathbb{N}_0$. Let $\mathrm{Ext}^{n-j}_R\left(R/\mathfrak{b}_\alpha, \mathrm{H}^j_{I,J}(M)\right)=0$ for any $\mathfrak{b}_\alpha\in\mathcal{B}$, $n=t,\ t+1$, and all $j<t$. Then $\mathrm{H}^t_{\mathcal{B}}(M)\subseteq\mathrm{H}^t_{I,J}(M)$ and $\mathrm{H}^i_{\mathcal{B}}(M)=0$ for all $i<t$.*

Proof. By Proposition 2.1 and Lemma 2.2, for $\mathcal{S}=0$ and $\mathrm{G}(-)=\Gamma_{I,J}(-)$, we have $\mathrm{Ext}^t_R\left(R/\mathfrak{b}_\alpha, M\right)\cong\mathrm{Hom}_R\left(R/\mathfrak{b}_\alpha,\mathrm{H}^t_{I,J}(M)\right)$ for any $\mathfrak{b}_\alpha\in\mathcal{B}$. Now, by [8, Theorem 1.2.11 and Remarks 1.3.7], we get $\mathrm{H}^t_{\mathcal{B}}(M)\cong\Gamma_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathrm{H}^t_{I,J}(M))\subseteq\mathrm{H}^t_{I,J}(M)$, as required. □

Corollary 2.5. *Let $t\in\mathbb{N}_0$ be such that $\mathrm{H}^i_{I,J}(M)=0$ for all $i<t$. Then $\mathrm{H}^i_{\mathfrak{b}}(M)\subseteq\mathrm{H}^i_{I,J}(M)$ for any $\mathfrak{b}\in\tilde{W}(I,J)$ and all $i\leq t$ and so $\mathrm{H}^i_{\mathfrak{b}}(M)=0$ for all $i<t$. In particular, when $J=0$.*

Proof. Apply Proposition 2.4 for $\mathcal{B}=\{\mathfrak{b}^n\}_{n\geq 1}$. □

The next theorem is one of the main results in this section which is used in some results of this paper. Recall that an R-module M is said to be ZD-module, if for every submodule N of M, the set of zero-divisors of M/N is a union of finitely many prime ideals in $\mathrm{Ass}(M/N)$.(See [10])

Theorem 2.6. *Let $t\in\mathbb{N}_0$ be such that $\mathrm{H}^i_{I,J}(M)=0$ for all $i<t$. Then the following statements hold for any $\mathfrak{a}\in\tilde{W}(I,J)$.*

$$\text{(i)}\quad \begin{aligned}\mathrm{Hom}_R\left(R/\mathfrak{a},\mathrm{H}^t_{\mathfrak{a}}(M)\right)&\cong\mathrm{Ext}^t_R\left(R/\mathfrak{a},M\right)\\&\cong\mathrm{Hom}_R\left(R/\mathfrak{a},\mathrm{H}^t_{\mathfrak{a},J}(M)\right)\\&\cong\mathrm{Hom}_R\left(R/\mathfrak{a},\mathrm{H}^t_{I,J}(M)\right)\end{aligned}$$

(ii) $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}\big(\mathrm{H}^t_{\mathfrak{a}}(M)\big)\cong\mathrm{H}^t_{\mathfrak{a}}(M)\cong\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}\big(\mathrm{H}^t_{\mathfrak{a},J}(M)\big)\cong\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}\big(\mathrm{H}^t_{I,J}(M)\big)$

(iii) $\mathrm{H}^i_{\mathfrak{a}}(M)\subseteq\mathrm{H}^i_{\mathfrak{a},J}(M)$ *for all $i\leq t$.*

(iv) $\mathrm{H}^i_{\mathfrak{a},J}(M)\subseteq\mathrm{H}^i_{I,J}(M)$ *for all $i\leq t$.*

(v) $\mathrm{H}^i_{\mathfrak{a}}(M)\subseteq\mathrm{H}^i_{I,J}(M)$ *for all $i\leq t$.*

(vi) $\mathrm{H}^i_{\mathfrak{a},J}(M)=\mathrm{H}^i_{\mathfrak{a}}(M)=0$ *for all $i<t$.*

$$\text{(vii)}\quad \begin{aligned}\mathrm{Ass}\big(\mathrm{H}^t_{\mathfrak{a}}(M)\big)&=\mathrm{Ass}\big(\mathrm{H}^t_{\mathfrak{a},J}(M)\big)\cap\mathrm{V}(\mathfrak{a})\\&=\mathrm{Ass}\big(\mathrm{H}^t_{I,J}(M)\big)\cap\mathrm{V}(\mathfrak{a}).\end{aligned}$$

(viii) *If $\mathfrak{a}\neq 0$ and M is ZD-module, then there exists a regular M-sequence of length t contained in $\mathfrak{a}$.*

Proof. (i) Let $\mathrm{G}_1(-)=\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(-)$, $\mathrm{G}_2(-)=\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a},J}(-)$, $\mathrm{G}_3(-)=\Gamma_{I,J}(-)$, and $\mathcal{S}=0$. Now, the assertion follows from Proposition 2.1 and Lemma 2.2.

(ii) Since $\mathfrak{a}\in\tilde{W}(I,J)$ implies that $\mathfrak{a}^n\in\tilde{W}(I,J)$ for any $n\in\mathbb{N}$, the result follows from (i).

(iii) It is obvious by part (ii).

(iv) Apply Corollary 2.5 and [17, Theorem 3.2].

(v) It is obvious by parts (iii) , (iv).

(vi) It is a consequence of parts (iv) , (v).

(vii) It is obvious by part (i) and [9, Exercise 1.2.27].

(viii) First note that $\mathrm{H}^i_{\mathfrak{a}}(M)=0$ for all $i<t$, by (vi). By induction on t, we construct a regular M-sequence $x_1,x_2,\cdots,x_t$ such that $x_j\in\mathfrak{a}$ for $j=1,2,\cdots,t$. When $t=0$, there is nothing to prove. Let

$t=1$. Then $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a}}(M)=0$. Since M is ZD-module and $\mathfrak{a}$-torsion free, by the prime Avoidance Theorem, $\mathfrak{a}$ is not contained in $\mathrm{Zd}(M)$. So, there exists an element $x_1 \in \mathfrak{a}$ such that $x_1 \notin \mathrm{Zd}(M)$. This proves the case $t=1$. Now, let $t>1$ and the assertion be true for $t-1$. By the above observation, $\mathfrak{a}$ contains an element x_1 which is a non-zerodivisor on M. Considering the exact sequence

$$\mathrm{H}^j_{\mathfrak{a}}(M) \to \mathrm{H}^j_{\mathfrak{a}}(M/x_1M) \to \mathrm{H}^{j+1}_{\mathfrak{a}}(M),$$

for all $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we obtain $\mathrm{H}^j_{\mathfrak{a}}(M/x_1M)=0$ for all $j<t-1$. Now, by inductive hypothesis, there is a regular M/x_1M-sequence $x_2, x_3, \cdots, x_t$ such that $x_j \in \mathfrak{a}$ for all $j=2,3,\cdots,t$. Therefore $x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_t$ is a regular M-sequence. □

Corollary 2.7. *Let $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then $\mathrm{H}^i_{I,J}(M)=0$ for all $i<t$ if and only if $\mathrm{H}^i_{\mathfrak{a}}(M)=0$ for any $\mathfrak{a} \in \tilde{W}(I,J)$ and all $i<t$.*

Proof. The assertion follows easily from Theorem 2.6 (vi) and [17, Theorem 3.2]. □

Corollary 2.8. *Let M be a finite R-module and $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$ be such that $\mathrm{H}^i_{I,J}(M)=0$ for all $i<t$. If $\mathrm{H}^t_{I,J}(M)$ is finite, then $\mathfrak{a}^m\,\mathrm{H}^t_{\mathfrak{a}}(M)=0$ for any $\mathfrak{a} \in \tilde{W}(I,J)$ and some $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$.*

Proof. The assertion follows easily from Theorem 2.6 (v) and [8, Proposition 9.1.2]. □

Corollary 2.9. *Let $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$ be such that $\mathrm{H}^i_{I,J}(M)=0$ for all $i<t$. Then for any $\mathfrak{a} \in \tilde{W}(I,J)$ and any $\mathfrak{b} \in \tilde{W}(I,0)$, we have*

(i) $\mathrm{Hom}_R\big(R/I, \mathrm{H}^t_{\mathfrak{a},J}(M)\big) \subseteq \mathrm{Ext}^t_R\big(R/I, M\big)$.
(ii) $\Gamma_I\big(\mathrm{H}^t_{\mathfrak{a},J}(M)\big) \subseteq \mathrm{H}^t_I(M)$.
(iii) $\mathrm{Hom}_R\big(R/\mathfrak{b}, \mathrm{H}^t_I(M)\big) \cong \mathrm{Ext}^t_R\big(R/\mathfrak{b}, M\big)$.
(iv) $\mathrm{Ext}^t_R\big(R/\mathfrak{b}, M\big) \subseteq \mathrm{Ext}^t_R\big(R/I^m, M\big)$ *for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, when $\mathfrak{b} \supseteq I$ the result holds for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, and so* $\mathrm{Ext}^t_R\big(R/\mathfrak{b}, M\big) \subseteq \mathrm{H}^t_I(M)$.
(v) $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{b}}\big(\mathrm{H}^t_I(M)\big) \cong \mathrm{H}^t_{\mathfrak{b}}(M)$ *and so* $\mathrm{H}^t_{\mathfrak{b}}(M) \subseteq \mathrm{H}^t_I(M)$ *and* $\mathrm{Ass}\big(\mathrm{H}^t_{\mathfrak{b}}(M)\big) \subseteq \mathrm{Ass}\big(\mathrm{H}^t_I(M)\big)$.
(vi) $\mathrm{Ass}\big(\mathrm{H}^t_{\mathfrak{b}}(M)\big) = \mathrm{Ass}\big(\mathrm{H}^t_I(M)\big) \cap \mathrm{V}(\mathfrak{b})$.

Proof. (i) By Theorem 2.6 (iv), $\big(0 :_{\mathrm{H}^t_{\mathfrak{a},J}(M)} I\big) \subseteq \big(0 :_{\mathrm{H}^t_{I,J}(M)} I\big)$. Now, again apply Theorem 2.6 (i) for $\mathfrak{a}=I$.

(ii) Use part (i).

(iii) Apply Lemma 2.2 and Proposition 2.1 for $\mathrm{G}(-)=\Gamma_I(-)$ and $\mathcal{S}=0$.

(iv) Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $I^m \subseteq \mathfrak{b}$. Then since $\big(0 :_{\mathrm{H}^t_{I,J}(M)} \mathfrak{b}\big) \subseteq \big(0 :_{\mathrm{H}^t_{I,J}(M)} I^m\big)$, the assertion follows from Theorem 2.6 (i).

(v) It is clear by (iii), since $\mathfrak{b}^n \in \tilde{W}(I,0)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

(vi) Apply part (v) and [17, Proposition 1.10] for $J=0$. □

As an application of the above results, we obtain vanishing and finiteness results for $\mathrm{H}^t_{I,J}(M)$ in Corollary 2.12. To achieve the result, we need the following proposition which gets the same result as in [3, Lemma 3.1] for an arbitrary Serre subcategory $\mathcal{S}$ of the category of R-modules.

Proposition 2.10. *Let $\mathfrak{a}$ be an ideal of R. Then $\mathfrak{a}M \in \mathcal{S}$ if and only if $M/(0 :_M \mathfrak{a}) \in \mathcal{S}$.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mathfrak{a} := (a_1, ..., a_n)$. ($\Rightarrow$) Define $f : M \to (\mathfrak{a}M)^n$ by $f(m) = \big(a_i m\big)_{i=1}^n$. Then since $M/(0 :_M \mathfrak{a})$ is isomorphic to a submodule of $(\mathfrak{a}M)^n$ and $(\mathfrak{a}M)^n \in \mathcal{S}$, the assertion follows.

($\Leftarrow$) Define $g : M^n \to \mathfrak{a}M$ by $g\big((m_i)_{i=1}^n\big) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i m_i$. Then $\mathfrak{a}M$ is a homomorphic image of $\big(M/(0 :_M \mathfrak{a})\big)^n$. Since $\big(M/(0 :_M \mathfrak{a})\big)^n \in \mathcal{S}$, the assertion follows. □

Corollary 2.11. *Let* $\mathfrak{a} \in \tilde{W}(I, J)$. *Let* $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$ *be such that* $\operatorname{Ext}^t_R(R/\mathfrak{a}, M)$ *and* $\operatorname{Ext}^{n-j}_R\big(R/\mathfrak{a}, \mathrm{H}^j_{I,J}(M)\big)$ *belong to* $\mathcal{S}$ *for* $n = t,\ t+1$, *and all* $j < t$. *Then* $\mathrm{H}^t_{I,J}(M) \in \mathcal{S}$ *if and only if* $\mathfrak{a}\,\mathrm{H}^t_{I,J}(M) \in \mathcal{S}$. *In particular for* $\mathfrak{a} = I$.

Proof. ($\Rightarrow$) It is obvious.

($\Leftarrow$) The assertion follows from Proposition 2.10, [1, Theorem 2.9 (i)], and the short exact sequence

$$0 \to (0 :_{\mathrm{H}^t_{I,J}(M)} \mathfrak{a}) \to \mathrm{H}^t_{I,J}(M) \to \mathrm{H}^t_{I,J}(M)/(0 :_{\mathrm{H}^t_{I,J}(M)} \mathfrak{a}) \to 0.$$

□

Corollary 2.12. *Let* $\mathfrak{a} \in \tilde{W}(I, J)$. *Let* $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$ *be such that* $\operatorname{Ext}^t_R(R/\mathfrak{a}, M)$ *and* $\operatorname{Ext}^{n-j}_R\big(R/\mathfrak{a}, \mathrm{H}^j_{I,J}(M)\big)$ *are finite for* $n = t,\ t+1$, *and all* $j < t$. *Then*

(i) $\mathrm{H}^t_{I,J}(M)$ *is finite if and only if* $\mathfrak{a}\,\mathrm{H}^t_{I,J}(M)$ *is finite.*
(ii) $\mathrm{H}^t_{I,J}(M) = 0$ *if and only if* $\mathfrak{a}\,\mathrm{H}^t_{I,J}(M) = 0$.

Proof. Apply Corollary 2.11 for the classes of finite and Zero R-modules. □

In local case, it is shown that the local cohomology with respect to the maximal ideal of R is concerned with the local cohomology with respect to an ideal generated by any filter regular sequence. (See [13, Lemma 3.4]). In Theorem 2.13, as a final result of this section, we obtain this in a noetherian (not necessary local) ring for a k-regular M-sequence ($k \geq -1$).
For a subset T of $\operatorname{Spec}(R)$ and an integer $i \geq -1$, we set

$$(T)_{>i} := \{\mathfrak{p} \in T \mid \dim(R/\mathfrak{p}) > i\},$$

$$(T)_{\leq i} := \{\mathfrak{p} \in T \mid \dim(R/\mathfrak{p}) \leq i\}.$$

Recall that, for an integer $k \geq -1$, a sequence $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ of elements of R is called a *poor* k*-regular* M*-sequence* whenever $a_i \notin \mathfrak{p}$ for all

$$\mathfrak{p} \in \big(\operatorname{Ass}(M/\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} a_j M)\big)_{>k}$$

and all $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Moreover, if $\dim(M/\sum_{i=1}^n a_i M) > k$, then $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ is called a k*-regular* M*-sequence*. It easy to see that, any poor k*-regular* M*-sequence* is a poor $(k+1)$*-regular* M*-sequence* and for an ideal I of R if $\big(\operatorname{Supp}(M/IM)\big)_{>k+1} \neq \phi$, then any k*-regular* M*-sequence* in I is a $(k+1)$*-regular* M*-sequence* in I. (To verify for various k, see [6], [11], [16], [4], [14], and [7]).

Theorem 2.13. *Let* $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n$ *be a* k*-regular* M*-sequence in* I *and set* $\mathfrak{a} := (a_1, \ldots, a_n)$. *If* $\big(\big(\operatorname{Supp}(M) \cap \mathrm{W}(\mathfrak{a}, J)\big) \setminus \mathrm{W}(I, J)\big)_{\leq k} = \emptyset$, *then* $\mathrm{H}^i_{I,J}(M) \cong \mathrm{H}^i_{\mathfrak{a},J}(M)$ *for all* $i < n$. *In particular for* $J = 0$.

Proof. Let

$$0 \longrightarrow E^0 \xrightarrow{d^0} E^1 \xrightarrow{d^1} \cdots \longrightarrow E^i \xrightarrow{d^i} \cdots$$

be a minimal injective resolution for M. For all $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we have

$$E^i = \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Supp}(M)} \mu_i(\mathfrak{p}, M) E(R/\mathfrak{p})$$

in which $\mu_i(\mathfrak{p}, M)$ is the $i-th$ Bass number of M at the prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of R. Let $i < n$ and $\mathfrak{p} \in \big(\operatorname{Supp}(M) \cap \mathrm{W}(\mathfrak{a}, J)\big)_{>k}$. By [6, Theorem 2.3 (ii)], since $a_1/1, \ldots, a_n/1$ is a regular $M_{\mathfrak{p}}$-sequence, we have

$$\mu_i(\mathfrak{p}, M) = 0. \tag{1}$$

Now, by [17, Proposition 1.11], we have

$$\Gamma_{I,J}(E^i) \ = \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Supp}(M) \cap \mathrm{W}(I,J)} \mu_i(\mathfrak{p}, M) E(R/\mathfrak{p}). \tag{2}$$

for all $i < n$. Similarly, for the ideal $\mathfrak{a}$, we get

$$\Gamma_{\mathfrak{a},J}(E^i) \ = \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Supp}(M) \cap \mathrm{W}(\mathfrak{a},J)} \mu_i(\mathfrak{p}, M) E(R/\mathfrak{p}), \tag{3}$$

for all $i < n$. On the other hand by [17, Proposition 1.6], $\mathrm{W}(I, J) \subseteq \mathrm{W}(\mathfrak{a}, J)$. So that by (1), (2), (3) and our assumption, we get

$$\Gamma_{I,J}(E^i) = \Gamma_{\mathfrak{a},J}(E^i),$$

for all $i < n$. It therefore follows that

$$\mathrm{H}^i_{I,J}(M) = \mathrm{H}^i_{\mathfrak{a},J}(M),$$

for all $i < n$, as required. □

3. Depth of (I, J) on modules

In this section, we introduce the concept of depth of a pair of ideals (I, J) on a module M. By [8, Theorem 6.2.7], for an ideal $\mathfrak{a}$ of R and a finite R-module M with $\mathfrak{a}M \neq M$, the depth$(\mathfrak{a}, M)$ is the least integer i such that $\mathrm{H}^i_{\mathfrak{a}}(M) \neq 0$. Having this in mind, we give the following definition.

Definition 3.1. Let I , J be two ideals of R and let M be an R-module. We define the depth of (I, J) on M by

$$\operatorname{depth}(I, J, M) = \inf \big\{\operatorname{depth}(\mathfrak{a}, M) \mid \mathfrak{a} \in \tilde{W}(I, J)\big\},$$

if this infimum exists, and ∞ otherwise.

Remark 3.2. If M is a finite R-module such that $\mathfrak{a}M = M$ for any $\mathfrak{a} \in \tilde{W}(I, J)$, then by [8, Exercise 6.2.6] and [17, Theorem 3.2], we get $\mathrm{H}^i_{I,J}(M) = 0$, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$. But if there exists $\mathfrak{a} \in \tilde{W}(I, J)$ such that $\mathfrak{a}M \neq M$, then $\operatorname{depth}(I, J, M) < \infty$. Also, it is clear by definition that if $J = 0$, then $\operatorname{depth}(I, J, M)$ coincides with $\operatorname{depth}(I, M)$.

Proposition 3.3. *For a finite R-module M, we have the following equalities.*

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{depth}(I, J, M) &= \inf \big\{i \in \mathbb{N}_0 \mid \mathrm{H}^i_{I,J}(M) \neq 0\big\}. \\ &= \inf \big\{\operatorname{depth}(\mathfrak{p}, M) \mid \mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{W}(I, J)\big\}. \\ &= \inf \big\{\operatorname{depth}(M_{\mathfrak{p}}) \mid \mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{W}(I, J)\big\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $s := \operatorname{depth}(I, J, M)$ and $t := \inf\left\{i \in \mathbb{N}_0 \mid \mathrm{H}^i_{I,J}(M) \neq 0\right\}$. Thus there exists $\mathfrak{b} \in \tilde{W}(I, J)$ such that $s = \operatorname{depth}(\mathfrak{b}, M)$. Since $\mathrm{V}(\mathfrak{b}) \subseteq \mathrm{W}(I, J)$, so by [9, Proposition 1.2.10] and [17, Theorem 4.1], we have

$$\begin{aligned} s = \operatorname{depth}(\mathfrak{b}, M) &= \inf\left\{\operatorname{depth}(M_\mathfrak{p}) \mid \mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{V}(\mathfrak{b})\right\} \\ &\geq \inf\left\{\operatorname{depth}(M_\mathfrak{p}) \mid \mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{W}(I, J)\right\} = t. \end{aligned}$$

If $t < s$, then $\mathrm{H}^t_\mathfrak{a}(M) = 0$ for all $\mathfrak{a} \in \tilde{W}(I, J)$. Thus, by [17, Theorem 3.2], we get $\mathrm{H}^t_{I,J}(M) = 0$, which is a contradiction. Thus $t = s$. For the second equality, since $\operatorname{depth}(\mathfrak{a}, M) = \inf\left\{\operatorname{depth}(\mathfrak{p}, M) \mid \mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{V}(\mathfrak{a})\right\}$, the equality follows from definition. Finally, the third equality follows from [17, Theorem 4.1]. □

Comparing the concept of depth of a pair of ideals with the ordinary depth of an ideal, we have the following result.

Corollary 3.4. *For a finite R-module M and all $\mathfrak{a} \in \tilde{W}(I, J)$, we have*

$$\operatorname{depth}(I, J, M) \leq \operatorname{depth}(\mathfrak{a}, J, M) \leq \operatorname{depth}(\mathfrak{a}, M),$$

in particular for $\mathfrak{a} = I$.

Proof. Apply Proposition 3.3 and Theorem 2.6 (iv) and (iii). □

There is an example which shows that this new invariant is different from the ordinary depth (see Example 4.3).

In next two propositions, we prove formulas and inequalities for this invariant. Also, we examine how it behaves under various ideal theoretic operations and short exact sequences.

Proposition 3.5. *Let I, J, $\mathfrak{b}$, $\mathfrak{c}$ be ideals of R and M be a finite R-module.*

(i) *If $J^n \subseteq \mathfrak{b}^m$ for some $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, then* $\operatorname{depth}(I, \mathfrak{b}, M) \leq \operatorname{depth}(I, J, M)$.
(ii) *If $J^n \supseteq \mathfrak{c}^m$ for some $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$, then* $\operatorname{depth}(I, J, M) = \operatorname{depth}(I + \mathfrak{c}, J, M)$.
(iii) *If $\sqrt{I} = \sqrt{\mathfrak{b}}$, then* $\operatorname{depth}(I, J, M) = \operatorname{depth}(\mathfrak{b}, J, M)$.
(iv) *If $\sqrt{J} = \sqrt{\mathfrak{c}}$, then* $\operatorname{depth}(I, J, M) = \operatorname{depth}(I, \mathfrak{c}, M)$.
(v) $\operatorname{depth}(I, J, M) = \operatorname{depth}(\sqrt{I}, J, M) = \operatorname{depth}(I, \sqrt{J}, M) = \operatorname{depth}(\sqrt{I}, \sqrt{J}, M)$.
(vi) $\operatorname{depth}(I, J\mathfrak{b}, M) = \operatorname{depth}(I, J \cap \mathfrak{b}, M)$.

Proof. All these statements follow easily from Proposition 3.3 and [17, Proposition 1.4, 1.6]. As an illustration, we just prove statement (i). Since $J^n \subseteq \mathfrak{b}^m$, we have $\mathrm{W}(I, J) \subseteq \mathrm{W}(I, \mathfrak{b})$, by [17, Proposition 1.6]. Now, by Proposition 3.3, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{depth}(I, \mathfrak{b}, M) &= \inf\left\{\operatorname{depth}(\mathfrak{p}, M) \mid \mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{W}(I, \mathfrak{b})\right\} \\ &\leq \inf\left\{\operatorname{depth}(\mathfrak{q}, M) \mid \mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{W}(I, J)\right\} = \operatorname{depth}(I, J, M). \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 3.6. *Let $0 \to U \to M \to N \to 0$ be an exact sequence of finite R-modules. Let* $r := \operatorname{depth}(I, J, U)$, $t := \operatorname{depth}(I, J, M)$ *and* $s := \operatorname{depth}(I, J, N)$. *Then*

(i) $t \geq \min\{r, s\}$.
(ii) $r \geq \min\{t, s + 1\}$.
(iii) $s \geq \min\{r - 1, t\}$.
(iv) *One of the following equalities holds :*

$$t = r\ ,\ t = s\ ,\ t = r = s\ ,\ s = r - 1.$$

Proof. For (i),(ii),(iii) apply Corollary 3.4 and [9, Proposition 1.2.9].
To prove (iv), suppose that none of the equalities holds. Then only one of the following cases happens:

(a) $r < s < t$ (b) $s < r < t$ (c) $t < r < s$
(d) $t < s < r$ (e) $s < t < r$ (f) $r < t < s$.

Let $r < s < t$. Then $s + 1 \leq t$ and by (ii), $s + 1 \leq r < s$, which is a contradiction.
If $s < r < t$, then $s \leq r - 1 < t$. Thus by (iii), $r - 1 \leq s$. Therefore $s = r - 1$, which is a contradiction.
The same method can be applied to the other cases. □

Next, we give some conditions, for which the depth of a pair of ideals equals to the ordinary depth.

Theorem 3.7. *Let M be a finite R-module. Let $t := depth(I, J, M)$. Then for any $\mathfrak{a} \in \tilde{W}(I, J)$ with $\mathfrak{a}M \neq M$, the following statements are equivalent.*

(i) $\operatorname{Hom}_R\big(R/\mathfrak{a}, \operatorname{H}^t_{\mathfrak{a}}(M)\big) \neq 0$.
(ii) $\operatorname{Hom}_R\big(R/\mathfrak{a}, \operatorname{H}^t_{\mathfrak{a},J}(M)\big) \neq 0$.
(iii) $\operatorname{Ext}^t_R\big(R/\mathfrak{a}, M\big) \neq 0$
(iv) $\operatorname{Hom}_R\big(R/\mathfrak{a}, \operatorname{H}^t_{I,J}(M)\big) \neq 0$
(v) $\operatorname{depth}(\mathfrak{a}, M) = t$.

Proof. All the equivalence of parts (i)–(iv) are consequences of Theorem 2.6 (i).
To prove (iii)⇔(v) Apply Proposition 3.3, Theorem 2.6, and [9, Proposition 1.2.10 (e)] □

Theorem 3.8. *Let M be a finite R-module and $t := \operatorname{depth}(I, J, M)$. Then for any ideal $\mathfrak{b} \in \tilde{W}(I, 0)$ such that $\mathfrak{b}M \neq M$, the following statements are equivalent.*

(i) $\operatorname{Hom}_R\big(R/\mathfrak{b}, \operatorname{H}^t_I(M)\big) \neq 0$.
(ii) $\operatorname{Ext}^t_R\big(R/\mathfrak{b}, M\big) \neq 0$
(iii) $\operatorname{depth}(\mathfrak{b}, M) = t$.

Proof. Apply Corollary 2.9 and Theorems 3.7 and 2.6 (vi). □

Theorem 3.9. *Let M be a finite R-module such that $IM \neq M$. Let $t := \operatorname{depth}(I, J, M)$. Then the following statements are fulfilled.*

(i) $\operatorname{H}^t_I(M) \neq 0$ *if and only if* $t = \operatorname{depth}(I, M)$.
(ii) *If* $\operatorname{H}^t_I(M) \neq 0$, *then* $\operatorname{depth}(I, M) \leq \operatorname{depth}(\mathfrak{a}, M)$ *for all* $\mathfrak{a} \in \tilde{W}(I, J)$.
(iii) $\operatorname{depth}(\mathfrak{p}, M) = t$ *for all* $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Ass}\big(\operatorname{H}^t_{I,J}(M)\big)$.
(iv) $\operatorname{depth}(\mathfrak{p}, M) \leq \operatorname{depth}(\mathfrak{a}, M)$ *for all* $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Ass}\big(\operatorname{H}^t_{I,J}(M)\big)$ *and all* $\mathfrak{a} \in \tilde{W}(I, J)$.
(v)
$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{Hom}_R\big(R/I, \operatorname{H}^t_{I,J}(M)\big) &\cong \operatorname{Ext}^t_R\big(R/I, M\big)\\ &\cong \operatorname{Hom}_R\big(R/I, \operatorname{H}^t_I(M)\big)\\ &\cong \operatorname{Hom}_R\big(R/I, M/(x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_t)M\big),\end{aligned}$$
where $x_1, x_2, \cdots, x_t$ is a poor regular M-sequence in I.

Proof. (i) The assertion follows from Theorem 2.6 (vi) and [8, Theorem 6.2.7].
(ii) This is an immediate consequence of part (i) and Corollary 3.4.
(iii) Apply Corollary 3.3 and [18, Theorem 3.6].
(iv) Apply part (iii) and Corollary 3.4.

(v) Apply Proposition 2.6 (i) and [9, Lemma 1.2.4]. □

4. (I, J)-Cohen–Macaulay modules

As a generalization of the concept of Cohen–Macaulay modules, we introduce the concept of (I, J)-Cohen–Macaulay modules by using the concept of depth of a pair of ideals. The following lemma and proposition have a main role in some results on this section.

Lemma 4.1. *Let R be an integral domain and $\mathfrak{a}$ be an ideal of R. Let M be a faithful finite R-module of finite Krull dimension d. Then $\dim M/\mathfrak{a}M = d$ if and only if $\mathfrak{a} = 0$.*

Proof. The assertion is obvious, since $(0) \in \operatorname{Supp}(M)$ and if $\mathfrak{a} \neq 0$, then $(0) \notin \operatorname{Supp}(M/\mathfrak{a}M)$. □

Proposition 4.2. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a local integral domain, $I + J$ is an $\mathfrak{m}$-primary ideal, and M be a faithful finite R-module of Krull dimension d. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $\dim M/JM = d$;
- (ii) $J = 0$;
- (iii) $\mathrm{H}^d_{I,J}(M) \neq 0$.

In particular for $M = R$.

Proof. Apply Lemma 4.1 and [17, Theorem 4.5]. □

Corollary 4.3. *Let $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ be a local integral domain of dimension n and J be a non-zero proper ideal of R. Then $\mathrm{H}^n_{I,J}(N) = 0$, for any R-module N, in particular when R is a regular local ring and $N = R$.*

Proof. Since $J \neq 0$, then $\dim R/J < n$, by Lemma 4.1. Now, the assertion follows from [17, Corollary 4.4]. □

Example 4.4. By [8, Corollary 6.2.9], if $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ is a regular local ring of dimension n, then n is the unique integer i for which $\mathrm{H}^n_{\mathfrak{m}}(R) \neq 0$. This result may not be true for local cohomology modules with respect to a pair of ideals. To see this, let k be a field and $R := k[[x, y]]$. Let $\mathfrak{m} := (x, y)R$ and $J := (x)R$. Then R is a regular local ring with $\dim R = 2 > \dim R/J = 1$. So that $\mathrm{H}^2_{\mathfrak{m},J}(R) = 0$, by Corollary 4.3. Moreover $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{m},J}(R) = 0$. So, by Theorem 2.6 (vi) and Grothendieck's non-vanishing Theorem, we get $\mathrm{H}^1_{\mathfrak{m},J}(R) \neq 0$. Therefore, by Proposition 3.3, $\operatorname{depth}(\mathfrak{m}, J, R) = 1 = \dim R/J < \dim R = \operatorname{depth} R$. This motivates us to give the following definition.

Definition 4.5. Let R be a noetherian ring and I , J be two ideals of R. An R-module M is called an (I, J)-Cohen–Macaulay R-module if $M \neq 0$ and $\operatorname{depth}(I, J, M) = \dim M/JM$ or if $M = 0$. If R itself is an (I, J)-Cohen–Macaulay module we say that R is an (I, J)-Cohen–Macaulay ring.

By definition, it is obvious that if M is an (I, J)-Cohen–Macaulay module, then J is a proper ideal. Also, if $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ is local, $I = \mathfrak{m}$, and $J = 0$, then the concept of (I, J)-Cohen–Macaulay finite R-modules coincides with Cohen–Macaulay R-modules.

Remark 4.6. By Corollary 3.4 and [17, Theorem 4.3], if $(R, \mathfrak{m})$ is a local ring, then any (I, J)-Cohen–Macaulay finite R-module M is $(\mathfrak{m}, J)$-Cohen–Macaulay R-module. Moreover, by [17, Proposition 1.4 (6),(7)], if $I + J$ is $\mathfrak{m}$-primary, then M is (I, J)-Cohen–Macaulay if and only if M is $(\mathfrak{m}, J)$-Cohen–Macaulay.

Proposition 4.7. *Let M be a finite R-module. If M is (I,J)-*Cohen–Macaulay*, then M is $(\mathfrak{a},J)$-*Cohen–Macaulay *for any $\mathfrak{a}\in \tilde{W}(I,J)$.*

Proof. The assertion follows easily from Corollary 3.4. ☐

In next two propositions, we show that the two concepts of (I,J)-Cohen–Macaulay and Cohen–Macaulay modules are not the same.

Proposition 4.8. *Let $(R,\mathfrak{m})$ be a local integral domain and $J\neq 0$. Let M be a faithful finite R-module and let $t=\operatorname{depth}(I,J,M)$ be such that $\operatorname{Hom}_R\left(R/\mathfrak{m},\mathrm{H}^t_{I,J}(M)\right)\neq 0$. If M is (I,J)-Cohen–Macaulay, then M is not Cohen–Macaulay.*

Proof. By Remark 4.6, M is $(\mathfrak{m},J)$-Cohen–Macaulay. Now, the assertion follows from definition, Theorem 3.7 for $\mathfrak{a}=\mathfrak{m}$, and Lemma 4.1. ☐

Proposition 4.9. *Let $(R,\mathfrak{m})$ be a local integral domain and $J\neq 0$. Let M be a faithful finite R-module and let $t=\operatorname{depth}(\mathfrak{m},J,M)$ be such that $\mathrm{H}^t_{\mathfrak{m}}(M)\neq 0$. If M is $(\mathfrak{m},J)$-Cohen–Macaulay, then M is not Cohen–Macaulay. In particular for $M=R$.*

Proof. Apply Theorem 3.9 and Lemma 4.1. ☐

Proposition 4.10. *Let $(R,\mathfrak{m})$ be a local ring and I,J be proper ideals of R. Let $M\neq 0$ be a finite (I,J)-*Cohen–Macaulay *R-module. If $t=\operatorname{grade}(I,J,M)\geq 1$, then $\mathrm{H}^t_{I,J}(M)$ is not finite.*

Proof. Since M is (I,J)-Cohen–Macaulay, so $\dim M/JM=t$. Now, the assertion follows from [1, Corollary 4.12 (ii)]. ☐

Remark and Examples 4.11. It is considerable that that if $\operatorname{Hom}_R\left(R/\mathfrak{m},\mathrm{H}^t_{I,J}(M)\right)=0$ in Proposition 4.8, and $\mathrm{H}^t_{\mathfrak{m}}(M)=0$ in Proposition 4.9, then the assertions do not necessarily hold. For example, let k be a field and $R:=k[[x,y]]$, $\mathfrak{m}:=(x,y)R$, and $J:=(x)R$.

(i) R is a Cohen–Macaulay ring and as we saw in Example 4.4, $\operatorname{depth}(\mathfrak{m},J,R)=1$. So that R is $(\mathfrak{m},J)$-Cohen–Macaulay ring.
(ii) By Proposition 4.10 and Example 4.4, $\mathrm{H}^1_{\mathfrak{m},J}(R)$ is not finite.
(iii) If $I:=(x^2)R$, then $\Gamma_{I,J}(R)=R$ and so R is not (I,J)-Cohen–Macaulay.

The next result can be a generalization of [8, Corollary 6.2.8] which gives a bound for non-vanishing of local cohomology modules in local case.

Proposition 4.12. *Let M be a non-zero finite module over the local ring $(R,\mathfrak{m})$ and $J\neq R$. Then any integer i for which $\mathrm{H}^i_{\mathfrak{m},J}(M)\neq 0$ must satisfy*

$$\operatorname{depth}(\mathfrak{m},J,M)\leq i\leq \dim M/JM,$$

while for i at either extremity of this range we do have $\mathrm{H}^i_{\mathfrak{m},J}(M)\neq 0$.

Proof. Apply Corollary 3.3 and [17, Theorem 4.5]. ☐

An immediate consequence of Proposition 4.12 is the following result.

Corollary 4.13. *Let $(R,\mathfrak{m})$ be a local ring and $M\neq 0$ be a finite R-module. Suppose that $I+J$ is an $\mathfrak{m}$-primary ideal. Then there is exactly one integer i for which $\mathrm{H}^i_{I,J}(M)\neq 0$ if and only if $\operatorname{depth}(I,J,M)=\dim M/JM$, that is, if and only if M is an (I,J)-*Cohen–Macaulay *R-module.*

Proposition 4.14. *Let M be a finite (I, J)-torsion R-module. If M is (I, J)-*Cohen–Macaulay*, then M/JM is artinian.*

Proof. It is enough to show that $\operatorname{depth}(I, J, M) = 0$. Since $\Gamma_{I,J}(M) = M$, so $\mathrm{H}^i_{I,J}(M) = 0$, for all $i \geq 1$, by [17, Corollary 1.13]. Thus $\operatorname{depth}(I, J, M) = 0$, as required. □

References

1. M. Aghapournahr, Kh. Ahmadi-Amoli, and M. Y. Sadeghi, *Upper bounds, cofiniteness and artinianness of local cohomology modules defined by a pair of ideals*, arXiv:1211.4204v1, [Math.AC] 18-Nov 2012.
2. M. Aghapournahr and L. Melkersson, *A natural map in local cohomology*, Ark. Mat.,**48** (2010), 243–251.
3. M. Aghapournahr and L. Melkersson, *Finiteness properties of minimax and coatomic local cohomology modules*, Arch. Math., **94** (2010), 519–528.
4. Kh. Ahmadi-Amoli, *Filter regular sequences, local cohomology modules and singular sets.* Ph. D. Thesis, University for Teacher Education, Iran (1996).
5. Kh. Ahmadi-Amoli and M. Y. Sadeghi, *On the local cohomology modules definde by a pair of ideals and Serre subcategories*, arXiv:1208-5934v1, [Math.AC] 29-Aug 2012.
6. Kh. Ahmadi-Amoli and N. Sanaei, *On the k-regular sequences and the generalization of F-modules*, J. Korean Math. Soc. **49** (2012), (5), 1083–1096.
7. M. P. Brodmann and L. T. Nhan, *A finitness result for associated primes of certain ext-modules*, Comm. Algebra, **36**, (2008), no. 4, 1527–1536.
8. M. P. Brodmann and R.Y. Sharp, *Local cohomology : an algebraic introduction with geometric applications*, Cambridge University Press, 1998.
9. W. Bruns and J. Herzog, *Cohen-Macaulay rings*, Cambridge University Press, revised ed., 1998.
10. K. Divaani-Aazar and M. A. Esmkhani, *Artinianness of local cohomology modules of ZD-modules*, Comm. Algebra, **33**, (2005), 2857–2863.
11. R. Lü and Z. Tang, *The f-depth of an ideal on a module*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **130** (2002), no. 7, 1905–1912.
12. L. Melkersson, *Some applications of a criterion for artinianness of a module*, J. Pure. Appl. Algebra. **101**, (1995), no. 3, 291–303.
13. U. Nagal and P. Schenzel, *Cohomological annihilators and Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity*, Commutative Algebra: syzygies, multiplicities, and birational algebra, (South Hadley, MA, 1992), 307–328, Contemp. Math., **159**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, (1994),
14. L. T. Nhan, *On generalized regular sequences and the finiteness for associated primes of local cohomology modules.* Comm. Alg. **33** (2005), no. 3, 793–806.
15. D. Rees, *The grade of an ideal or module.* Proc. Camb. Philos. Soc. **53**,(1957), 28–42.
16. P. Schenzel, N. V. Trung, and N. T. Coung *Verallgemeinerte Cohen-Macaulay-Moduln*, Math. Nachr. **85**, (1978), 57–73.
17. R. Takahashi, Y. Yoshino, and T. Yoshizawa, *Local cohomology based on a nonclosed support defined by a pair of ideals*, J. Pure. Appl. Algebra. **213**, (2009), 582–600.
18. A. Tehranian and A. P. Talemi, *Cofiniteness of local cohomology based on a nonclosed support defined by a pair of ideals*, Bull. Iranian Math. Soc. **36** (2010), 145–155.

[1] Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Arak University, Arak, 38156-8-8349, Iran.
E-mail address: `m-aghapour@araku.ac.ir`

[2] Department of Mathematics, Payame Noor University, Tehran, 19395-3697, Iran.
E-mail address: `khahmadi@pnu.ac.ir`

[3] Department of Mathematics, Payame Noor University, Tehran, 19395-3697, Iran.
E-mail address: `m.sadeghi@phd.pnu.ac.ir`